

Comment on the proposed conservation of *Gigantopecten* Rovereto, 1899 and *Lissochlamys* Sacco, 1897 (Mollusca, Bivalvia, PECTINIDAE)
(Case 3343; see BZN 63: 155–162)

P. Bouchet

Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, 55 rue de Buffon, 75005 Paris, France
(e-mail: pbouchet@mnhn.fr)

The application by Waller & Bongrain documents the prevailing usage of *Gigantopecten* over *Macrochlamis* or *Macrochlamys*, and the evenly balanced usage of *Lissochlamys* and *Lissochlamis*. Although their application does not specifically address the issue, it must be pointed out to non-malacologists that the suffix *-chlamys* (derived from the generic name *Chlamys* Röding, 1798) is used in numerous pectinoid genus-group names. It serves consistency and mnemonics to treat *Macrochlamys* and *Lissochlamys* as the correct spellings.

However, it needs to be noted that Kasum-Zade (2003, pp. 47, 82) established the family-group name MACROCHLAMISINAE, based on *Macrochlamis* Sacco, 1897. If, as proposed in the application, the name *Macrochlamis* were suppressed and placed on the Official Index, MACROCHLAMISINAE Kasum-Zade, 2003 would become invalid under Article 39 of the Code. Therefore, I propose that, instead of the names *Macrochlamis* and *Lissochlamis* being suppressed, as suggested in the application, they should be declared incorrect original spellings of *Macrochlamys* and *Lissochlamys*. With this approach, MACROCHLAMISINAE Kasum-Zade, 2003 remains a potentially valid name, and nomenclature does not infringe on taxonomy.

It needs to be added that:

(1) '*Macrochlamys* Benson, 1832' is a nomen nudum. The name was first made available by Gray (1847, p. 169);

(2) *Grandipecten* Cossmann, 1914 (in Cossmann & Peyrot, 1914, p. 273) is another replacement name for '*Macrochlamys* Sacco, 1897, non Benson, 1832'. Cossmann (1920, p. 175) noted that *Gigantopecten* Rovereto, 1899, was an earlier replacement name, and *Grandipecten* Cossmann, 1914 could be placed on the Official Index.

Therefore I put forward the following alternative proposals to the Commission:

(1) to use its plenary power to rule that:

(a) *Macrochlamis* Sacco, 1897 is an incorrect original spelling of *Macrochlamys*;

(b) *Lissochlamis* Sacco, 1897 is an incorrect original spelling of *Lissochlamys*;

(2) to place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology the following names:

(a) *Macrochlamis* Sacco, 1897 (an incorrect original spelling of *Macrochlamys* as ruled in (1)(a) above);

(b) *Lissochlamis* Sacco, 1897 (an incorrect original spelling of *Lissochlamys* as ruled in (1)(b) above);

(c) *Macrochlamys* Sacco, 1897 (a junior homonym of *Macrochlamys* Gray, 1847);

(d) *Grandipecten* Cossmann, 1914 (an unnecessary replacement name for *Macrochlamys* Sacco, 1897).

I thank Alexander Guzhov (Moscow) for pointing out to me the work by Kasum-Zade (2003).

Additional references

- Cossmann, M. 1920, Rectifications de nomenclature. *Revue Critique de Paléozoologie et Paléophytologie*, **24**(4): 174–175.
- Cossmann, M. & Peyrot, A. 1914 (in 1909–1914). *Conchologie néogénique de l'Aquitaine. Pélécypodes*, vol. 2. Pp. 205–410, pls. 11–22. Bordeaux.
- Gray, J.E. 1847. A list of genera of Recent Mollusca, their synonyma and types. *Proceedings of the Zoological Society of London*, **15**: 129–182.
- Kasum-Zade, A.A. 2003. *Sostoyanie izuchennosti mezozoiskikh dvustvorchatykh mollyuskov Azerbaidzhana (Otryad Pectinopida: reviziya i sistematika)*. [Advance in research of Mesozoic bivalve molluscs in Azerbaijan (Order Pectinoida: revision and systematics)]. 112 pp. El-ALLiance, Baku.

Comment on the proposed conservation of *Obovaria* Rafinesque, 1819 (Mollusca, Bivalvia) by the designation of *Unio retusa* Lamarck, 1819 as the type species
(Case 3353; see BZN **63**: 226–230)

David Campbell

425 Scientific Collections Building, Department of Biological Sciences, Biodiversity and Systematics, University of Alabama, Box 870345, Tuscaloosa, AL 35487 0345, U.S.A. (e-mail: amblema@bama.ua.edu)

I am writing in support of the conservation of the current usage of *Obovaria*. As pointed out in the application, the current usage has held over the past 150 years. One minor correction is that Herrmannsen's designation of a type for *Obovaria* is in volume 2 (1849), not volume 1 (1847).

Additionally, no replacement name is available. Although two names are treated as junior subjective synonyms in the current literature, neither actually applies. The type species of *Pseudoon* Simpson, 1900 is *Unio ellipsis* Lea, 1828, a subjective synonym of *Amblesma olivaria* Rafinesque, 1820. Currently this species is listed as *Obovaria olivaria*. However, recent molecular data suggest that *O. olivaria* is closely related to, but not the sister taxon of, the other species currently assigned to *Obovaria* (see Campbell et al., 2005). This requires further sampling and analysis to confirm, but it does suggest that the differences noticed by Simpson (1900) may be of greater significance than currently realized. No molecular data exist for the nearly extinct *O. retusa* (Lamarck, 1819), the proposed type of *Obovaria*. However, Ortmann (1911) and Simpson (1900, 1914) reported its anatomy as matching other species assigned to the genus (except *O. olivaria*) for which molecular data are available.

Rotundaria Rafinesque, 1820, like *Obovaria*, has led to confusion due to overlooked type designations. Agassiz (1852) selected *Obliquaria tuberculata* Rafinesque, 1820 (currently *Cyclonaias tuberculata*) as the type of *Rotundaria*, and this was followed by most workers until Ortmann & Walker (1922) pointed out that